

line number comprising, *inter alia*, sending communication routing instructions from a service control point (SCP) to a service switching point (SSP), and completing the communication between the calling line and the called line using the communication routing instructions.

Amended claim 26 recites in an advanced intelligent network, a system for using voice activated dialing (VAD) service with respect to originating a communication from a first calling line number comprising an SCP being operative to instruct an SSP to route the communication to the called line.

Amended claim 32 recites in an advanced intelligent network, a method for preserving billing and interexchange carrier preferences of a subscriber using voice activated dialing (VAD) service with respect to originating a communication from a first calling line number comprising, *inter alia*, sending communication routing instructions from a service control point (SCP) to a service switching point (SSP) and completing the communication between the calling line and the called line using the communication routing instructions.

Cartier discloses automating the handling of calls involving a request for operator services, e.g. 0- calls. (See *Cartier* column 4, lines 38-42.) *Cartier* discloses an IP 121 that plays an announcement prompting the caller to input the destination telephone number. Upon hearing this announcement, a caller at station 101 dials-in or speaks-in NPA-NXX-XXXX digits of the destination telephone number (step S104). The IP 121 forwards the input digits to the SSP (step not separately shown), and the SSP of CO 111 transmits a Call_Info_From_Resource message containing the destination number through one or more of the STPs 115 to the ISCP 119 (step S114). (See *Cartier* column 21, lines 42-49.) The ISCP 119 formulates an Analyze_Route type response message and sends that message back to the SSP CO 111. In step S124, the ISCP 119 sends that response message through one or more of the STPs 115 back to the end office CO 111. (See *Cartier* column 21, lines 51-53.)

McKinley discloses a networked system of voice-activated dialers (VAD). When a calling party wishes to make a telephone call to a called party, the calling party dials a pre-designated telephone number to connect with a first VAD. The calling party then utters the name of the called party, and additionally specifies a second VAD or other information that could be used to find a second VAD by means of which the called party may be reached. (See *McKinley* column 2, lines 1-7.) *McKinley* further discloses that the first VAD 102 is additionally

configured to function as intelligent peripheral (IP), which is a part of an Intelligent Network (IN). The IP can be configured to perform some functions presently performed by other elements of a telephone network such as the Service Control Point (SCP) or a Service Switching Point (SSP). In general, an IP is configured to provide announcements to a party--such as a calling party--and collect information--such as additional digits required or a spoken utterance--to complete a call. (See *McKinley* column 4, lines 38-48.)

Schier discloses a method for completing a telephone call according to a caller's preferences without an excessive use of the caller's time to establish connection of the call to the desired number, and a method for adding the enhancement of a voice activated dialing option to a standard calling card which may be used by an individual quickly and inexpensively. (See *Schier* column 2, lines 12-20.) *Schier* discloses a VAD option service code which may be "*VAD" or "#56", depending on the structure of the particular service provider's protocol. (See *Schier* column 6, lines 30-34.)

In contrast with the claimed invention, the combination of *Cartier*, *McKinley*, and *Schier* fails to disclose, dropping the call path between the calling line and the intelligent peripheral when the SCP receives the first calling line number from the intelligent peripheral and completing the communication between the calling line and the called line, wherein the SCP instructs a service switching point (SSP) to route the communication to a called party, as recited in claim 1. *Cartier* does not disclose an SCP that instructs an SSP to route a communication to a called party. Instead, *Cartier* routes a communication from an IP to a switch 125 because the communication is identified as a 0+ operator requested telephone call. (See *Cartier* column 22, lines 18-32.) Both *McKinley* and *Schier* are silent with regard to such a limitation. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited prior art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1. Dependent Claims 2-10 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-10.

The combination of *Cartier*, *McKinley*, and *Schier* fails to disclose, an SSP being operative to query an SCP for instructions to route the communication and provide the identifying information to the SCP and upon receiving the query from the SSP, the SCP being

operative to instruct the SSP to complete the communication between the calling line and the called line, as recited in claim 12. *Cartier* does not disclose an SSP being operative to query an SCP for instructions to route the communication. Instead, the SSP of *Cartier* merely sends a Call_Info_From_Resource message to the ISCP in order to identify a digit input by a caller or give a further prompt. (See *Cartier* column 19, lines 29-41.) In addition, for the reasons mentioned above with respect to claim 1, *Cartier* fails to disclose an SCP being operative to instruct the SSP to complete the communication between the calling line and the called line. Both *McKinley* and *Schier* are silent with regard to such a limitation. Accordingly, independent Claim 12 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited prior art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 12. Dependent Claims 13-16 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 12, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 13-16.

The combination of *Cartier*, *McKinley*, and *Schier* fails to disclose, sending communication routing instructions from a service control point (SCP) to a service switching point (SSP), and completing the communication between the calling line and the called line using the communication routing instructions, as recited in claim 17. Claim 17 includes limitations similar to the limitations mentioned above with respect to Claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from the cited prior art for the reasons mentioned above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 17. Dependent Claims 18, 20-23 and 25 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 17, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 18, 20-23 and 25.

The combination of *Cartier*, *McKinley*, and *Schier* fails to disclose, an SCP being operative to instruct an SSP to route the communication to the called line, as recited in claim 26. Claim 26 includes limitations similar to the limitations mentioned above with respect to Claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from the cited prior art for the reasons mentioned above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 26. Dependent Claims 27 and 29-31 are also allowable at least for the reasons described

above regarding independent Claim 26, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 26. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 27 and 29-31.

The combination of *Cartier*, *McKinley*, and *Schier* fails to disclose, sending communication routing instructions from a service control point (SCP) to a service switching point (SSP) and completing the communication between the calling line and the called line using the communication routing instructions, as recited in claim 32. Claim 32 includes limitations similar to the limitations mentioned above with respect to Claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable from the cited prior art for the reasons mentioned above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 32. Dependent Claims 33 and 35-37 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 32, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 33 and 35-37.

CONCLUSION

A request for a three-month extension of time is requested for the period of June 10, 2006 through September 10, 2006, and is submitted with this amendment.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned please contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 404.954.5040.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC



Devon K. Grant
Reg. No. 57,036

Date: August 15, 2006

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5100

39262
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE